therefore it is ſaid *ver.* 26. *that he might be juſt, and the juſtifier of him who is of the faith of Jeſus*, as it is in another Tranſlation. Now if *Chriſt* is a Propitiation, without Mens imitating of him, then it is not thro' Faith in his Blood; and if it is thro' Faith or following of him, then the Author is miſtaken; for he ſays that GOD ſatisfied and propitiates himſelf *pages* 70, 71. he muſt mean by his Son's Merits, becauſe he ſays *pag.* 104. that *Chriſt* obtained of GOD that he would wait and be long ſuffering to Sinners; and *pag.* 271. he would not ſpare Sin, but puniſh it, tho' in his Son; and *pag.* 121. GOD could not pardon our Sins upon Repentance without Satisfaction; and *pag* 270. he hardned his heart againſt the Cry of his Son; and he was ſcorched with GOD's Wrath. Now put theſe things together, and then we may ſee that this Author means, that GOD hath ſatisfied and propitiated himſelf by his Sons Miſery: And how then is it thro' Faith in his Blood? If *Chriſt* is a Propitiation thro' Faith, as the Text ſays, then he is not ſo thro' Merits, as this Author, and all who own Satisfaction would have it. So that I conclude there is nothing in this Text, nor in any other, ſufficient to ſupport the Doctrine of Satisfaction.

Secondly, Mr. *Truman* calls this his Doctrine a Myſtery which none can underſtand, *pag.* 9, 72. and if ſo, then it cannot belong to the Scripture, and Men have nothing to do with it, as has been prov'd.

Thus, Sir, I have offer'd you a few Conſiderations, on this Subject. Wherein you ſee me miſtaken, I deſire your Information, which will oblige,

Your humble Servant,

EBEN. HEWLETT.

18

A REFINED *Quaker's* REMARKS ON BAPTISM: IN ANSWER TO Mr. CALEB FLEMING's Pamphlet, Intituled, *A Defence of* INFANT BAPTISM.

By EBEN. HEWLETT.

The Author calls himself a Refined Quaker, *because he thinks, tho' that People are nearest to Truth, yet they maintain some Errors.*

LONDON:

Printed, and Sold by M. COOPER in *Pater-noster Row*; and the Author in *Sun-street* without *Bishops-gate.*

MDCCXLV.

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

A REFINED

Quaker's Remarks

ON

BAPTISM.

INFANT Sprinkling, frequently called *Baptiſm*, has been, and is acknowledged by the greateſt Part of profeſſed Chriſtians, for many Ages paſt, as well as by the preſent Generation; and yet it is a Queſtion with me, as it is alſo with ſome others, If Infant Sprinkling is at all ſupported by Scripture or Reaſon? or, Whether any thing can ſupport it beſide Prieſt-craft and Bigotry? And, I imagine, Adult Baptiſm as now owned by the *Baptiſts*, will not bear Examination; however, my Deſign is, to make ſome Remarks on both in the following Lines.

Mr. *Fleming* allows, Page 47, that Infant Baptiſm, (as I think he vainly calls it) is not

expreſly commanded in Scripture; but only deduced by Inferences. I think proper therefore, to conſider ſome of his Deductions concerning Infant Baptiſm.

And then *Firſt*, He infers, or deduces from Scripture, That Infants are to be baptiſed, becauſe he imagines Baptiſm came in the Room of Circumciſion, I think, without the leaſt Shadow of Reaſon; for Circumciſion and Baptiſm don't agree in any one Circumſtance, p. 79. for, firſt, Circumciſion was by God poſitively appointed to continue to many Generations after its firſt Inſtitution; but Baptiſm, by Mr. *Fleming*'s own Confeſſion, was not injoined on future Ages, p. 80. Pray, What Reſemblance then can there be between Circumciſion and Baptiſm?

Secondly, Baptiſm was appointed to ſecure the Baptized from preſent impendent Danger; but none were ever ſaid to be ſaved by Circumciſion.

Thirdly, Circumciſion was abſolutely commanded to be adminiſtred to Infants; but this was not the Caſe with reſpect to Baptiſm, as this Author himſelf allows, p. 47.

Fourthly, Baptiſm was always made a Condition of Forgiveneſs of Sins, then paſt; but no Sin was ever promiſed to be forgiven, on Condition of any being circumciſed: So that Baptiſm did not at all agree with Circumciſion.

Fifthly, Circumciſion was adminiſtred to Males only; Baptiſm, to both Male and Female. He ſuppoſes both to be included in the Covenant, p. 79. Female Sins imputed to Males, unjuſt.

Now, notwithſtanding the apparent Difference between Circumciſion and Baptiſm, yet he will

will have it, that the Gospel-Covenant, and the *Abrahamic*, are the same, as p. 46. notwithstanding the Scripture makes such Distinctions between the Old and New Covenant. Under the Old Covenant they had a Proverb; *viz. The Fathers have eaten sour Grapes, and the Childrens Teeth are set on Edge*, Jer. xxxi. 29. It was Part of that Constitution, for Children to suffer temporal Calamities, because of their Father's Sins. But the New Covenant is quite different, as, that every one shall suffer for his own Sins; as you may see, if you compare *Hebrews* viii. with the thirty-first of *Jeremiah*. This one single Instance is enough, to set aside all that Mr. *Fleming* has, or can say, in favour of Infant Baptism. And, that his may appear plausible, he insinuates, p. 13, 14. that Infants are Disciples, and cites *Acts* xv. 10. because it is there said, *Why tempt ye God to lay a Yoke on the Necks of the Disciples, which neither we nor our Fathers were able to bear.* If Mr. *Fleming* had consider'd *Ver.* 5. he might have seen that the Keeping the Law was intended as the Yoke, and Circumcision, an Inlet to that Obligation. A Yoke signifies Confinement, continual Obligation; whereas Circumcision is only present Pain, not like a Yoke, continually on the Neck. The Apostle elsewhere says, that *if they were circumcised they were bound to keep the whole Law.* Besides, had there been no mention made of the Law here, yet even then it would be stupid to call Infants, *Disciples*; none can be Disciples but such as are capable to learn, and none but such can be under any Confinement or Yoke of

a Law

a Law. An Infant may as well be a Tradeſman as a Diſciple. One would wonder that a Miniſter could publiſh ſuch myſterious Stuff.

Theſe are ſome of Mr. *Fleming*'s Inferences and Deductions, to prove Infant Baptiſm by: P. 43. he ſays, As Baptiſm did initiate the firſt Chriſtians into this Scheme of Life, their Infants ſhould be ſo initiated. This with him is obvious Reaſon, without any expreſs Command. Death, he ſuppoſes, was brought on them and their Children, without their Conſent; that is, as I underſtand him, by *Adam*. He here ſuppoſes, that Baptiſm ſaved the Lives of the firſt Chriſtians, by initiating them into this Scheme of Life. If he will hold to his Argument, perhaps he may be ſet to Right bye-and-bye; for St. *Peter* ſaid, *They*, the firſt Chriſtians, *were ſaved by Baptiſm, as* Noah *and his Family were ſaved by the Ark*, that is, ſaved from Death. And St. *Paul* told the *Epheſians*, that *God would ſhew, in Ages to come, the exceeding Riches of his Grace, in his Kindneſs toward them of that Generation*, Eph. ii. 7. But is it not a monſtrous way of Deduction, to infer from hence, that all ſucceeding Ages were to be equally ſaved by Baptiſm, as they were? The World was then ſaid to be judged, and our Lord is ſaid to ſave the World, taſted Death for every Man, that is, as he himſelf expreſſes it, he *came to ſave Men's Lives*; as I have had Occaſion to explain it in ſeveral late Pamphlets. I can't find any who care to undertake to ſhew any real Advantage expected from Baptiſm now. There are, I ſuppoſe, as many baptiſed Infants die in Infancy as there

there are of thoſe not baptiſed at all. 'Tis apparent that Baptiſm don't now ſave any one's Life, as we are aſſured it did in the firſt Age of Chriſtianity, and therefore Baptiſm is now uſeleſs. Page 54. he allows of no Impartment at Baptiſm, no ſpiritual Light or Life; and what can induce him to Baptize Infants if they are nothing bettered by it? What no Impartment! and yet thereby initiated into a Scheme of Life as a Remedy againſt Death? Self-Contradictions. In p. 39. he ſays, the Denial of Baptiſm to Infants, has Marks of Crnelty in it, ſince Infants are certainly ſubjected to Death. This Right (of Baptiſm) applied to Infants, becomes a proper ſignificant Seal, or Token of Remiſſion.

Hewlett. What! do Infants ſtand in need of Pardon or Remiſſion of Sins?

Fleming. Not of perſonal Demerit; *In* Adam *all die, ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.*

Hew. Shall All be made alive ever the more, becauſe they are baptized?

Flem. Page 40. The Application of Baptiſm to Infants, may miniſter Comfort to Parents whoſe Offspring die in Infancy.

Hew. If this be the Caſe, then Baptiſm is the Cauſe of the Reſurrection; or elſe, Baptiſing of Infants could not miniſter Comfort to Parents, on that Account.

Flem. They are delivered from under the Dominion of Death; and 'tis the Application of Baptiſm to Infants, ſhould teach Parents not *to ſorrow, as thoſe who have no Hope.*

Hew. And pray, What then muſt they do, whoſe Children die in Infancy, and are not baptized?

baptized? Why, according to him, they are without Hope of their deceaſed Offspring's Salvation; for if, according to Mr. *Fleming*, Baptizing of Infants is the Cauſe why Parents ought not to be without Hope, then the Neglect of Baptizing their Infants would fill them with Deſpair and Horror concerning their deceaſed Infants, in relation to another World.

Flem. Page 88. Without Infants were, and continue to be baptiſed, Baptiſm might be loſt in the World.

Hew. I don't know any Good it does, unleſs 'tis to advance Prieſtcraft, Animoſity, and Errors among Mankind.

Flem. Were it not for Infant Baptiſm, there might not be any apparent Seed to ſerve the aſcended Jeſus.

Hew. Had this been the Caſe, we ſhould undoubtedly have heard ſomething about it, from Chriſt and his Apoſtles This is a doubtful Diſputation, becauſe he chuſes neither Scripture, Precepts, nor Example, to enforce it.

Flem. There is mention made of whole Houſholds baptiſed.

Hew There is no mention made of Infants, in thoſe Families: *Acts* xvi. We find, that the Jailor's Family were all grown to Years of Underſtanding, Verſes 32, 34. Here is one of his own Evidences witneſſing againſt him. Poor *Fleming*, He has here called two Witneſſes for him, out of *Acts* xvi. and behold, one of the two Witneſſes are againſt him, and the other ſays nothing about it. He ought firſt to examine his Witneſſes before he brought them: In this Caſe, he

he muſt be condemned by every impartial Judge.

But Mr. *Fleming* has another Witneſs ready at hand, p. 84, 85, 86. from 1 *Cor.* x 2. where, ſpeaking of the *Iſraelites*, ſaid, *And were all baptized unto* Moſes *in the Cloud, and in the Sea.* He ſays, Mr. *B.* repreſents it as a Being incompaſſing their Bodies overwhelmed; and ſo, according to Mr. *Fleming*, Mr. *B.* has [illegible]oſed this Baptiſm to *mean* Water Baptiſm. This is, undoubtedly, a great Miſtake; and I find, Mr. *Fleming* has the Advantage of Mr. *B.* in this Argument; for, if that is Water Baptiſm there intended, then Infants were Baptized without being plunged all over in Water.

But I look upon them both to be miſtaken in this Matter. If this may be properly called *Water Baptiſm*, then their Cattle were as much baptized as were they and their Children. If this is compared with *Mark* xvi. *Go, preach the Goſpel to every Creature*; that is, to Men, Women and Children, and Cattle; *every one of them who do believe, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved.* I confeſs, I cannot but think, that it would do the Cattle as much good, to baptize them, as it would do Infants: I ſay, again, I don't imagine that this Water Baptiſm is meant, not their being dipt in Water when baptiſed *in the Cloud, and in the Sea*: The Word *Baptize*, was never heard of till *John* came, by the ſpecial Command of God, to Baptize; 'tis ſaid, he Baptized in *Enon, becauſe there was much Water*, John iii 23. And the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt and Afflictions, were only Alluſions to real Baptiſm. Water Baptiſm

 diſtinct

differed from Washing and Burial, but is compared to both, tho' never compared to Sprinkling; that has no Alluſion to Baptiſm. And to ſuppoſe that the *Iſraelites* were Water-ſprinkled, is groundleſs: This of their going thro' the *Red Sea*, was never called *Baptiſm* till after Baptiſm was practiſed by *John*. Note, when any thing is to be compared to Baptiſm, it always ſignifies a great Quantity thereof, whether Trials, Afflictions or the extaordinary miraculous Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt. To call Sprinkling *Baptiſm*, is what was contrary to the *New Teſtament* Writers.

This Mr. *Fleming* formerly ſuppoſed, the Goſpel of Chriſt to have loſt all its Features, by being overſpread with Errors. See his *Remarks on Mr.* Chubb's *Goſpel*, p. 6. of his *Epiſtle*; but now he can vindicate ſome of the groſſeſt Errors; ſuch as *Adam*'s Sin entail'd on Infants: for if Infants are to be baptiſed, for Remiſſion of Sins not their own, as p. 39. then muſt *Adam*'s Sin be imputed to Infants, or elſe there is no Occaſion of Baptiſm, on that Account. If the Scripture had poſitively commanded Infants to be baptiſed from Generation to Generation, as was the Caſe with reſpect to Circumciſion, then one would examine the Reaſonableneſs of it: But for Mr. *Fleming*, and others, to endeavour to plead for more than God has appointed to be obſerved, is either Ignorance, Inattention, or a Deſign to deceive. Baptiſm had then done its Office, when the then World of living Creatures were ſaved thereby, as *Noah*'s Ark had done its Office, when they who were in it were reſtored to dry Land again.

The

The meaneſt Capacity may ſee that this Text, 1 *Cor.* x. 2. will not ſerve Mr. *B*'s Turn, nor Mr. *Fleming*'s, becauſe they cited this as Water Baptiſm, whereas there was no Water touch'd any of their Bodies, that we know of by the Hiſtorian.

Whereas the *New Teſtament* Writers, when writing of Water Baptiſm lets us know, that it was done where was great Plenty of Water: He Baptized there, *becauſe there was much Water.* This Baptiſm *in the Sea, and in the Cloud,* I take to be, their being overwhelmed in ſurpriſing Trials, not in Water; *by Faith they went through the* Red Sea, *Heb.* xi. 29. And as it appears moſt certainly manifeſt, that this Baptiſm *in the Sea, and in the Cloud,* was not Water Baptiſm; but a Baptiſm of ſevere Trials: So their Infants, and their Cattle, were exempted from having any Share in this ſurpriſing Baptiſm, or being overwhelmed in Fears and Dangers; becauſe they had not Capacities to be thus baptized. This exactly agrees with Chriſt's Inſtitution of Baptiſm: *Go and preach the Goſpel to every Creature; he that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved:* They who had no Abilities to receive Goſpel Truths, were no more concerned in Baptiſm than the Trees of the Field. See *p.* 74.

Theſe Gentlemen have beſtowed a great deal of Pains, to ſhew the Difference between *in, into,* and *from,* and *out of*; but, as they have left it darker than they found it, I refer to thoſe Texts where the Intentions of thoſe Words are much plainer than in their Pamphlet.

Page 89. He ſuppoſes, that the Words *unto Moſes* meant, *into Moſes*; and thus eaſy Things are made hard by Miniſters, who ought to make hard Things eaſy. But 'tis eaſy to underſtand what is meant: Namely, That all were plung'd in Difficulties, and overwhelm'd in ſurpriſing Dangers: *Unto Moſes*, that is, *Moſes*, as well as the reſt, were in deep Diſtreſs. This Idea is agreeable to the Text and Context, and to *Exod.* xiv. Our Lord called his Sufferings *Baptiſm*, as alſo thoſe Sufferings his Diſciples were to undergo. Sure he did not mean Water Baptiſm by theſe ſevere Trials. The ſame may be ſaid of the ſurpriſing Danger the *Iſraelites* were in, that Night they went through the *Red Sea*. Thus we may ſee, that this Text he depended ſo much on, is nothing to his Purpoſe.

Page 63. he ſays, That the People were greatly alarmed by *John's* Baptiſm, and yet, in p. 65, 66. he will have it, That *John* did no more than was cuſtomary for their Prieſts to do. Strange, that they ſhould be ſo greatly alarm'd at what was ſo common among them! Not one Word of Baptiſm in the *Old Teſtament*, or Why did they ſend to know, whether he was the Chriſt, or that Prophet, becauſe he came Baptizing? Therefore I conclude, Mr. *Fleming* is miſtaken, in reſpect to this alſo.

See Page 70. He there ſuppoſes, that the Baptiſm was ſuitable to introduce into a new Conſtitution, as it had been uſed to Proſelites before. Pray, Mr. *Fleming*, What Argument is there in all this? Certainly none at all: For had his Baptiſm been the ſame as was practiſed before, they

they might as well have aſked one another, Why doſt thou, or thou baptize? The Anſwer to ſuch a Queſtion would be naturally this: Becauſe it is a Cuſtom ſo to do. *John* might have ſaid to them, Ye are Prieſts as well as I am, and why do you baptize. One would think, a Miniſter would be aſham'd of ſuch mean Suppoſitions to confound plain Ideas!

Again, Page 93. he ſays, if the Actions of going down and coming up out of, did indicate Plunging, it would equally ſhew, that *Philip* was plunged with the Eunuch. Mr. *Fleming*, perhaps, may think he has here ſhewn more Wit than Sincerity. Going down and coming up out of, are Words that cannot be underſtood without other Words joined with them, if we add (the Water), and ſay, *Philip* and the Eunuch both of them went down into the Water, and he baptized him, and they came up out of the Water, Do you think *Philp* went down into the Water himſelf, and gave the Eunuch the Trouble to go into the Water alſo, to ſprinkle him? That he could have done without going down into the Water. Page 93. you charge others with Prejudice, but I believe you had need look at home; you charge your Adverſaries with Bigotry, and yet, I think, I can diſcern more of it in this your Performance, than ever I have ſeen in any before.

You blame the *Baptiſt* for being cenſorious and uncharitable, and yet, as I hinted before, you, in effect, lay the Streſs of Infant's Salvation, if they die in Infancy, on their being baptized; Is not this uncharitable cenſoring, yea, is it not Blaſphemy? In

In Page 33. Mr. *Fleming* brings us two Inſtances to inſinuate, that Infants may be baptized, tho' the Reaſonableneſs thereof be not fully known: *Firſt*, That of *Abraham* Offering up of his Son *Iſaac*. *Secondly*, That of Waſhing the Diſciples Feet. As to that of *Abraham*, he was ſure that, if he killed him, God would raiſe him from the Dead, becauſe he had a Promiſe, That in *Iſaac* his Seed ſhould be called, *Heb.* xi. 18, 19. He knew that his Son would receive no real Damage by it, and he had God's Command for it. Is this a ſufficient Excuſe to take the Name of God in vain over Infants, and then ſay, they are baptized? As to our Lord's Waſhing the Diſciples Feet, tho' they did not know, at firſt, his Deſign in ſo doing: Can this juſtify Mr. *Fleming* to ſprinkle Infants in the Name of God, without any Authority from him? Was it ever ſaid, that they fulfilled Righteouſneſs thereby? this was no Act of theirs. But the Scripture aſſures us, that baptized Perſons went with a Deſign to be baptized down into the Water of their own Choice. And I defy Mr. *Fleming* to produce one Inſtance from Scripture, of any Perſon baptized againſt their Conſent; and therefore all the Inſtances which he has brought of this Nature are weak, trifling Impertinences, to amuſe the Ignorant. In p. 34. he ſays, Mr. *Blays* lays undue Streſs upon meer Authority; but Mr. *Fleming* has laid undue Streſs upon Infant Sprinkling, without any the leaſt Authority. Page 35. he cites Dr. *Groſvenor* to vouch for him, that meer poſitive Appointments are not abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation; and yet

Baptiſm

Baptiſm, in the *New Teſtament*, had the Promiſe of Pardon and Salvation (not Infant Sprinkling). See how theſe Gentlemen contradict themſelves; ſometimes 'tis not material to Salvation; at another time, 'tis that Holineſs without which no Man ſhall ſee the Lord. P. 37. he there ſuppoſes, that the Lord's Supper was appointed for Pardon of Sins, and not Baptiſm; tho' the *New Teſtament* is ready to condemn this Whimſey alſo.

Pardon of Sins was never promiſed on Condition of eating the Lord's Supper, as it was on Condition of being Baptized. This his Performance is ſtuffed with groundleſs Imaginations. Again, p. 38, 39. he ſuppoſes, that tho' Repentance, a Change of Mind, was at firſt eſſential to Baptiſm, yet it was not the Seal of actual Pardon, becauſe ſome might be baptized who were vicious.

I deſire Mr. *Fleming* to conſider, that thoſe of the firſt Chriſtians who publickly profeſſed Chriſt, run great Hazards of being abuſed for their ſo doing; and of Conſequence, none would be baptized who did not ſtrongly believe a Reward for their ſo doing. This therefore ſhut out all worldly Advantage, and ſo vicious Men had nothing to induce them to be baptized, unleſs the Hope of Pardon, and then muſt believe; and ſo under an abſolute Promiſe of Pardon and Salvation. And your ſaying, that they were only initiated into a Conſtitution of Grace and Pardon, which muſt ſuppoſe that they who were baptized, ſhall always, after Baptiſm, be pardon'd, be they never ſo wicked, even without Repentance; or, that if they were not baptized, they ſhould not be pardoned if they repent and reform. Either of which

tends

tends to deſtroy all true Religion. To maintain Infant Baptiſm, P. 60, 61. he ſuppoſes, that to Baptize Infants, is to fulfill Righteouſneſs, and yet can produce no Scripture Authority for ſo doing, and his Deductions are all falſe Reaſoning.

P. 58. he ſuppoſes, that *Cornelius*, and they with him were baptized without their Conſent, becauſe *Peter* did not aſk their Conſent. Mr. *Fleming* ought to conſider, that Baptiſm was a Privilege to the firſt Chriſtians, tho' 'tis none to any now, as is naturally deduced from what Mr. *B.* and he has ſaid on this Head; but in p. 50. he is a Witneſs againſt himſelf: He freely owns Baptiſm, in its firſt Application, did require the Conſent of all adult Perſons who embraced the Chriſtian Doctrine. This is *Fleming* againſt *Caleb*, and both againſt Truth.

This Author frequently mentions Chriſt's bleſſing the Infants, p. 46. and many more from *Mat.* xix. 14. *Mark* x. 14. *He laid his Hands on them, and bleſſed them*, that is, Infants; and why may not I infer or ſurmiſe as he has done, through this his Pamphlet.

1*ſt*. I imagine that there is not one Word of Baptiſm in this Text here referr'd to. 2*dly*, In *Ver.* 3. it is ſaid, *the Phariſees came to him tempting him concerning Marriages.* After he had anſwered their captious Queries on that Account, and thereby ſtirred up ſome Reſentments, even in his own Diſciples, againſt what he had ſaid, *Ver.* 10. *ver.* 13. *they brought little Children to him*, not to be baptized, but to be bleſſed; perhaps to tempt him to ſlight Infants, that ſo People about him might be incenſed againſt him.

Ver.

Ver. 15. *he laid his Hands on them*, and departed, as tho' he was weary of being tempted any more. 2*dly*. This Action of bleſſing Infants was never heard of as done by him before or after, no nor by any of his Apoſtles. There was at another time when he was tempted, he delivered a Woman taken in Adultery, from her Accuſers. This ſingle Inſtance of this kind, is not a Proof that he countenanced Vice; neither is his bleſſing little Children, at a time when his Enemies were endeavouring to inſnare him, any Proof that Infants muſt be Church-members; bleſſing Infants is very different from baptizing them: Whatever Bleſſing our Lord beſtowed on theſe Infants, yet we are ſure that Pardon of Sins, promiſed on Condition of Baptiſm, could not be intended; becauſe they were not then capable to commit Sin, not the leaſt Reſemblance of Baptiſm. Mr. *Fleming* wants Mr. *B.* to prove that Chriſt did not fulfill Righteouſneſs as much, when circumciſed, as he did when he was baptized, p. 57. And alſo, to prove Baptiſm to be Plunging, p. 93. and that Infants were not Diſciples, p. 13, 14. And he might alſo as well demand of Mr. *B.* to prove, that Jeſus was not a Carpenter as ſoon as he was born; a hard Taſk for M. *B.* to perform: How can he make Mr. *Fleming* ſenſible that he was not actually a Carpenter as ſoon as he was born? As well as he fulfilleth Righteouſneſs at eight Days old, as much as at thirty Years old; or, as much as Infants are Diſciples. Why, Mr. *B.* cannot bring any Text to prove, either that Infants are not Scholars or Diſciples, or actually righteous, or real Carpenters. Theſe negative Propoſitions are

what Mr. *Fleming* deals in very much, to deceive thoſe who don't carefully attend his unreaſonable Suppoſitions.

This Author frequently ſuppoſes Infants to be Church-members. This is even contrary to the common Acceptation of the Word; a Church, in the *Dictionary*, ſignifys *a Society of Chriſtians.* No Perſon can be a Chriſtian unleſs he believes in Chriſt, therefore an Infant cannot be a Member of Chriſt's Church; and I defy Mr. *Fleming* to clear himſelf from this Charge of Folly; I call it Folly, becauſe 'tis a departing from the firſt principal Foundation of Knowledge. If the Scripture do call Infants Church-members, then that Book is not according to our common Conception of Words; to ſay, Infants are Members of Chriſt's Church, is, I think, as bad as 'tis to ſay, the Trees of the Field can ſpeak. If the *Bible* does no where call Infants *Church-members*, then Mr. *Fleming* ought to be ſorry that he has publiſh'd ſuch Errors to corrupt Mankind. Can God account an Infant a Believer in Chriſt, (without which he cannot be a Church-member) then he may, by the ſame Rule, impute Sin to the Innocent, or Righteouſneſs to the Wicked: If an Infant may be accounted a Church-member (a Believer), then an Infant may be a wilful Sinner; for both a Church member, and a wicked Perſon, muſt be an active, rational, accountable Creature, capable of judging between Good and Evil, which an Infant is not capable of. Theſe Ideas are ſo plain, that 'tis needleſs to go to School to learn them. No: But it appears to me, that they go to School to make Error

appear

appear to be like Truth; Millions of Pounds have been beſtowed on Learning to teach Religion, and after all, an unlearned Perſon knows more than they: I have known ſome who have been more than twenty Years inquiring and ſearching after religious Ideas, and after all, did not diſtinguiſh between Juſtification and Pardon, and between the Words *have been ſaved*, and *ſhall be ſaved*, nor between temporal Salvation and eternal Salvation; others, by their Learning, have endeavoured to make God the Author of Sin. I would be bound to prove, that a Child of twelve Years of age could learn more of theſe plain Ideas in one Hour, than thoſe learned Gentlemen do learn for twenty or thirty Years together. And I don't find the *Baptiſts* behind-hand with their Brethren in Nonſenſe: They ſay, that Baptiſm muſt continue to all Generations, without the leaſt Intimation from Scripture of its Continuance, only becauſe 'tis ſaid, *Mat.* xxviii. 20. *Lo I am with you always, even to the End of the World.* 'Tis not ſaid, Men ſhall be baptized to the End of the World. And 'tis evident from *Mark* xvi. that his being with them meant, to enable them to work Miracles. Some Men even rack their Brains to make the Scripture to ſpeak what it never did intend. If Baptiſm was to continue to all Generations, then, according to Scripture, all who are baptized, are ſure of Pardon of Sins, when thus baptized. If this is true, then no wonder if they condemn all who don't ſubmit to their Way of Baptiſm, as that they cannot attain to Pardon of Sins, nor Salvation. This makes the *Baptiſt* ſo arrogant, ſo uncharitable to

others:

others, and how can Mr. *Fleming* blame theſe *Baptiſts*, ſeeing he owns a Continuance of Baptiſm to all Generations ; for ſure, if Baptiſm is to be adminiſtered for Remiſſion of Sins now, as it was when it was firſt inſtituted, then none can lay Claim either to Pardon or Salvation, unleſs they are baptized ; and if Infants cannot be proper Objects of Pardon of Sins, becauſe they are not capable of ſinning, and others, who are grown to Years of Underſtanding, have no Aſſurance of Pardon and Salvation, unleſs they are baptized ; and if this Salvation is to be future in another World, then Men may be happy hereafter, tho' never ſo wicked, only becauſe they are baptized. This Notion tends to deſtroy all revealed and natural Religion, yea, it tends to ruin all Societies ; becauſe, if this is true, then Baptiſm ſtands in the room of Repentance and Reformation ; for, 'tis manifeſt, that in the firſt Age of Chriſtianity, none were exempted from Baptiſm becauſe they were wicked, if they believed, they were intitled to Baptiſm; if they were baptized, they were intitled to Pardon and Salvation, witneſs *Simon* the Sorcerer, *Acts* viii. 9, 13. When he believed and was baptized he was then intitled to Pardon and Salvation, tho' he was not reformed.

F I N I S.

Publiſh'd,

By the ſame Author, EBEN. HEWLETT.

1. THE Doctrine of Satisfaction by the Merits of Chriſt, ſuppoſed to be Blaſphemy againſt God and his Son Jeſus Chriſt, an Enemy to the holy Scriptures, and to our preſent Proteſtant Government; with a Hindrance to Men's Salvation. *Briſtol* printed 1733, and Re-printed 1744. *Price* 9 *d.*

2. An Anſwer to Mr. *John Gill*'s Pamphlet, intitled *Truth Defended*, and his Queries on *Romans* ix. carefully examined. To which is added, a Dialogue between Chriſt and a *Calviniſt* Sinner at the Day of Judgment. *Price* 3 *d.*

3. A Harmony in Chriſtianity; Being an Anſwer to Mr. *Chubb*'s Book, intituled, *The true Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt*: Wherein is ſhewn, that Mr. *Chubb* has been guilty of plain Self-contradictions in his attempting to overthrow the Authority of Scripture; that Mr. *Fleming* and Mr. *Hallett* have rather encouraged Deiſm than confuted it; as alſo a plain Proof of the Certainty of Goſpel-Revelation. *Price* 6 *d.* 1738.

4. A Catechiſm for Mr. *Whitfield* and his Followers, to learn them not to blaſpheme God; being ſome Remarks by way of Diſpute between Mr. *Seagrave* and *Eben. Hewlett*, about Mr. *Whitefield*'s Doctrine, at *Blackwell*'s Coffee-houſe, near *Queen-ſtreet*, London, *September* 8. 1739. *Price* 3 *d.*

5. An

An Anſwer to a great Queſtion, *viz.* Whether it is conſiſtent with the Perfections of God, to forſake his innocent Son in the Agonies of Death, if he did not impute Mens Sins to him? Alſo ſome Obſervations on Mr. *Chubb*'s Reaſoning againſt Prayer being prevalent in his Vindication of his Goſpel. *Price* 3 *d.* 1739.

6. The Deiſt turn'd Chriſtian, the Papiſt turn'd Proteſtant, and the *Calviniſt* turned *Arminian*, by being undeceived concerning the Doctrine of free Juſtification by Chriſt's Blood, By way of Dialogue, between *Eben. Hewlet* and a Deiſt. *Price* 6 *d.* 1741.

7. A Vindication of Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*, and the Author of *the Whole Duty of Man*, from the Cenſure of Mr. *Whiteſield* and Mr. *Weſtley*; with ſome Remarks on their erroneous Doctrine. *Price* 2 *d.* 1740.

8. A Vindication of the *Bible* from the Cenſures of the Deiſts, and Inconſiſtency of Popery and *Calviniſm*; being ſome Remarks on Dr. *Morgan*'s *Moral Philoſopher*, and on *the Scheme of Literal Prophecy*; wherein is ſhewn, that all their Objections are founded on Forgery and Deceit. *Price* 1 *s.* 1741. To which is added, by way of *Appendix*, an Anſwer to Mr. *Sam. Chandler*'s Miſrepreſentation of a *Moral Philoſpher*.

9. Miracles, real Evidences of a divine Revelation, and the Influence of Evil Angels carefully examined; in anſwer to Mr. *Chubb* on Miracles, and Mr. *Fleming*'s Animadverſons thereon: Wherein is proved, that both Mr. *Chubb* and

and Mr. *Fleming* have misrepresented the Case of Miracles, of Angels, of casting out Devils, and the like. Also an Answer to Mr. *Chubb*'s Question, Whether the Doctrine of the future Existence of Men, and a future Retribution were plainly taught by *Moses*, and the Prophets. *Price* 6 *d.* 1741.

10. Christianity refined from the Errors of Popery, *Calvinism*, *Deism*, *Arianism*, *Arminianism*, *Socinianism*, by proving that tho' Christ died for the Sins of the World then alive, yet he did not die for our Sins. *Price* 3 *d.* 1741.

11. Deism in Distress, being supported only by Deceit; in answer to Mr. *Elwall*'s Pamphlet, intituled, *the Supernatural Incarnation of Jesus Christ*, proved to be false. *Price* 3 *d.*

12. The Royal Spy-glass, to discover the Stone cut out of the Mountain without Hands, *Dan.* ii. 34. The Kingdom of the Saints is already begun, tho' they themselves oppose it. *Price* 4 *d.* 1743.

13. Deism founded only on Forgery and Deceit: In answer to a late Pamphlet, intituled, *The Resurrection of Jesus considered. Price* 2 *d.* 1744.

14. The Baptists Inquisition; held at the *George* in *George-yard*, *Lombard-street*, *London*. *Price* 2 *d.* 1743.

15. An Answer to Two Baptists Ministers, concerning Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

16 Remarks on Mr. *Barclay*'s Apology.

17.

17. Ancient apoſtolick Chriſtianity revived, and modern Chriſtianity, both among Papiſts and Proteſtants, reproved; being ſome Remarks on the Reverend Mr. *James Foſter*'s Sermon, intituled *Scripture Juſtification explained*, Vol. III. Serm. 2. and on a Pamphlet, entituled, *Chriſtianity not founded on Argument*. *Price* 6 *d*. 1744.

18. The Support of Popery diſcover'd: In Anſwer to Mr. *Wilſon*, Mr. *Whitfield*, and Mr. *Weſtley*. *Price* 3 *d*. 1744.

Note, If any of thoſe Gentlemen, againſt whom I have written, have any Objections againſt any one of theſe my Propoſitions, I ſhall give my Attendance in *Sun-ſtreet* without *Biſhopſgate*, every *Friday* Evening, from Seven o'Clock till Nine, to anſwer all Objections. Or, if I cannot anſwer all Objections, I will immediatly publiſh my Recantation.

I beg that none of theſe Authors may, henceforward, give themſelves the Liberty to ſlander me privately, leſt I diſcover more of their Nakedneſs: Backbiting is a ſneaking mean-ſpirited Action, unbecoming of Chriſt's Miniſters.

19

Ancient Apoſtolick Chriſtianity revived; Modern Chriſtianity both amongſt Papiſts *and* Proteſtants *reproved:*

BEING SOME

REMARKS

On the Rev. Mr. *James Foſter's*

SERMON,

INTITLED

Scripture Juſtification explain'd.

Volume III. Sermon II.

And on a Pamphlet call'd

CHRISTIANITY not founded on Argument.

AS ALSO

That the binding Obligation to keep Sabbath does not belong to Chriſtianity.

In Anſwer to

Mr. *CORNTHWAIT.*

AND

Some Obſervations on Miracles, to confirm the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity.

By EBEN. HEWLETT.

LONDON:

Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-noſter-Row.* 1744.